

APR. 2. 2007 2:59PM 919-854-1401 MBS&S

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NO. 9350 P. 1

APR 02 2007

MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC, P.A.
Patent Attorneys
4140 Parklake Avenue, Suite 600, Raleigh, NC 27612

P.O. Box 37428, Raleigh, NC 27627
Telephone: 919-854-1400
Facsimile: 919-854-1401

**CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION
UNDER 37 CFR § 1.8**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U. S. Patent and Trademark Office via facsimile number 571-273-8300 on April 2, 2007 and is addressed to Mail Stop Appeal Brief - patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O., Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.


Amelia Tauchen

Attorney's Docket No.: 9209-10

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re: Tabares et al. Examiner: Diem K. Cao
Serial No.: 09/992,155 Group Art Unit: 2194
Filed: November 5, 2001 Confirmation No.: 5291
For: METHODS, SYSTEMS AND COMPUTER PROGRAM PRODUCTS FOR
INSTANTIATING A DEVICE DRIVER FOR COMMUNICATION WITH A DEVICE BY
DYNAMICALLY ASSOCIATING THE DEVICE DRIVER AT RUN-TIME WITH A DEVICE-
SPECIFIC AND/OR SERVICE-SPECIFIC SOFTWARE COMPONENT

ATTACHED:

Faxcover	1 page
Appeal Brief Transmittal	1 page
Appeal Brief	<u>23</u> pages
TOTAL	<u>25</u> pages

Confidentiality Note

The information contained in this facsimile message is legally privileged and confidential information intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby prohibited. If you have received this telexcopy in error, please immediately notify us by telephone and return the original message to us at the address above via the United States Postal Service. THANK YOU.

APR. 2. 2007 2:59PM 919-854-1401 MBS&S

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NO. 9350 P. 2

APR 02 2007

Attorney's Docket No.: 9209-10

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re: Tabares et al.

Serial No.: 09/992,155

Filed: November 5, 2001

For: METHODS, SYSTEMS AND COMPUTER PROGRAM PRODUCTS FOR
INSTANTIATING A DEVICE DRIVER FOR COMMUNICATION WITH A DEVICE
BY DYNAMICALLY ASSOCIATING THE DEVICE DRIVER AT RUN-TIME WITH
A DEVICE-SPECIFIC AND/OR SERVICE-SPECIFIC SOFTWARE COMPONENT


Date: April 2, 2007

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF
(PATENT APPLICATION-37 C.F.R. § 1.192)

1. Transmitted herewith is the APPEAL BRIEF for the above-identified application, pursuant to the "Notice of Appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences" filed January 29, 2007 and received in the U. S. Patent and Trademark Office January 31, 2007.
2. Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(c), the fee for filing the Appeal Brief is:
 small entity \$250.00
 other than small entity \$500.00
3. Charge Deposit Account No. 50-0220 in the amount \$500.00. Any additional fee or refund may be charged to Deposit Account 50-0220.

Respectfully submitted,




D. Scott Moore
Registration No. 42,011

Myers Bigel Sibley & Sajovec, P.A.
P. O. Box 37428
Raleigh, North Carolina 27627
Telephone: (919) 854-1400
Facsimile: (919) 854-1401
Customer No. 20792

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION
UNDER 37 CFR § 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U. S. Patent and Trademark Office via facsimile number 571-273-8300 on April 2, 2007 and is addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O., Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.


Amelia Tauchen

APR. 2. 2007 2:59PM 919-854-1401 MBS&S

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NO. 9350 P. 3

APR 02 2007

Attorney's Docket No.: 9209-10

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re: Tabares et al.
Serial No.: 09/992,155
Filed: November 5, 2001
For: METHODS, SYSTEMS AND COMPUTER PROGRAM PRODUCTS FOR
INSTANTIATING A DEVICE DRIVER FOR COMMUNICATION WITH A DEVICE
BY DYNAMICALLY ASSOCIATING THE DEVICE DRIVER AT RUN-TIME WITH
A DEVICE-SPECIFIC AND/OR SERVICE-SPECIFIC SOFTWARE COMPONENT

Date: April 2, 2007

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION
UNDER 37 CFR § 1.8

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the
U. S. Patent and Trademark Office via facsimile number 571-273-8300 on
April 2, 2007 and is addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for
Patents, P.O., Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.


Amelia Tauchen

APPELLANTS' BRIEF ON APPEAL UNDER 37 C.F.R. §41.37

Sir:

This Appeal Brief is filed pursuant to the "Notice of Appeal to the Board of Patent
Appeals and Interferences" filed January 29, 2007 and received in the U. S. Patent and
Trademark Office January 31, 2007.

Real Party In Interest

The real party in interest is assignee Trendium, Inc., Sunrise, Florida.

Related Appeals and Interferences

Appellants are aware of no appeals or interferences that would be affected by the present
appeal.

In re: Tabares et al.
Serial No.: 09/992,155
Page 2

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 02 2007

Status of Claims

Appellants appeal the final rejection of Claims 1 – 15, 20 – 34, and 39 – 53 as set forth in the Office Action mailed October 27, 2006 (hereinafter "Final Action"), which as of the filing date of this Brief remain under consideration. Claims 16 – 19, 35 – 38, and 54 – 57 have been canceled. Appellants submit that the claims involved in the appeal are independent Claims 1, 12, 20, 31, 39, and 50 and the rejected dependent Claims 2 – 11, 13 – 15, 21 – 30, 32 – 34, 40 – 49, and 51 – 53 as a reversal of the rejection of independent Claims 1, 12, 20, 31, 39, and 50 is requested in the present appeal and a reversal of the rejection of dependent Claims 2 – 11, 13 – 15, 21 – 30, 32 – 34, 40 – 49, and 51 – 53 is also requested based on the reversal of the rejection of the independent claims. Accordingly, the pending claims as included in Appellants' response to the Office Action of May 16, 2006 are attached hereto as Appendix A.

Status of Amendments

No responses after final rejection have been filed in the present case.

Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

Independent Claim 1 is directed to a computer implemented method of instantiating a device driver in which a first software component is dynamically associated with the device driver at run-time. The first software component contains information that facilitates communication with devices of a specific device type. (Specification, page 10, lines 13 – 18; FIG. 6).

Independent Claim 12 is directed to a computer implemented method of collecting data from a device. A request to collect data is received from the device. (Specification, page 11, lines 15 – 16; FIG. 9, block 132). A software component is dynamically associated with a device driver at run-time. The software component contains information that facilitates communication with the device. (Specification, page 11, lines 21 – 24; FIG. 9, block 134). Data is retrieved from the device using the device driver. (Specification, page 11, lines 24 – 25; FIG. 9, block 136).

Independent Claim 20 is directed to a system for instantiating a device driver that includes means for dynamically associating a first software component with the device driver at run-time. The first software component contains information that facilitates communication with

In re: Tabares et al.
Serial No.: 09/992,155
Page 3

devices of a specific device type. (Specification, page 10, lines 13 – 18; FIG. 6). The device driver manager 86, processor 72, and memory 74 of FIG. 3 provide structure for the means for dynamically associating.

Independent Claim 31 is directed to a system for collecting data from a device that includes means for receiving a request to collect data from the device. (Specification, page 11, lines 15 – 16; FIG. 9, block 132). In addition, the system includes means for dynamically associating a software component with a device driver at run-time. The software component contains information that facilitates communication with the device. (Specification, page 11, lines 21 – 24; FIG. 9, block 134). The system further includes means for retrieving data from the device using the device driver. (Specification, page 11, lines 24 – 25; FIG. 9, block 136). The access device program 84, processor 72, and memory 74 of FIG. 3 provide structure for the means for receiving. The device driver manager 86, processor 72, and memory 74 of FIG. 3 provide structure for the means for dynamically associating. The service management system 24 of FIG. 1 provides structure for the means for retrieving.

Independent Claim 39 is directed to a computer program product for instantiating a device driver in which a computer readable storage medium has computer readable program code embodied therein. (Specification, page 4, line 14 – page 5, line 3, and page 9, line 17 – page 10, line 8). The computer readable program code includes computer readable program code for dynamically associating a first software component with the device driver at run-time. The first software component contains information that facilitates communication with devices of a specific device type. (Specification, page 10, lines 13 – 18; FIG. 6).

Independent Claim 50 is directed to a computer program product for collecting data from a device in which a computer readable storage medium has computer readable program code embodied therein. (Specification, page 4, line 14 – page 5, line 3, and page 9, line 17 – page 10, line 8). The computer readable program code includes computer readable program code for receiving a request to collect data from the device. (Specification, page 11, lines 15 – 16; FIG. 9, block 132) and computer readable program code for dynamically associating a software component with a device driver at run-time. The software component contains information that facilitates communication with the device. (Specification, page 11, lines 21 – 24; FIG. 9, block 134). The computer readable program code further includes computer readable program code for

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTERIn re: Tabares et al.
Serial No.: 09/992,155
Page 4

APR 02 2007

retrieving data from the device using the device driver. (Specification, page 11, lines 24 – 25; FIG. 9, block 136).

Ground of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

Claims 1, 2, 10, 12, 13, 15, 20, 21, 29, 31, 32, 34, 39, 40, 48, 50, 51, and 53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0059474 to Camara et al. (hereinafter "Camara"). (Final Action, page 2).

Claims 9, 14, 28, 33, 47, and 52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Camara in view of Martin et al. (Professional XML). (Final Action, page 5).

Claims 3 – 5, 22 – 24, and 41 – 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Camara in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,473,824 to Kreissig et al. (Final Action, page 5).

Claims 11, 30, and 49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Camara in view of U. S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0034029 to Ramberg et al. (Final Action, page 7).

Claims 6, 25, and 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Camara in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,473,824 to Kreissig et al. and further in view of Martin et al. (Professional XML). (Final Action, page 7).

Argument**I. Introduction to 35 U.S.C. §102 /§103 Analysis**

Under 35 U.S.C. § 102, "a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." M.P.E.P. § 2131 (quoting *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co.*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)). "Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires the disclosure in a single piece of prior art of each and every limitation of a claimed invention." *Apple Computer Inc. v. Articulate Sys. Inc.*, 57 U.S.P.Q.2d 1057, 1061 (Fed. Cir. 2000). "The fact that a certain result or characteristic may occur or be present in the prior art is not sufficient to establish the inherency of that result or characteristic. To establish inherency, the extrinsic evidence 'must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the

In re: Tabares et al.
Serial No.: 09/992,155
Page 5

reference, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill. Inherency, however, may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient." M.P.E.P. § 2112 (citations omitted).

A finding of anticipation further requires that there must be no difference between the claimed invention and the disclosure of the cited reference as viewed by one of ordinary skill in the art. *See Scripps Clinic & Research Foundation v. Genentech Inc.*, 927 F.2d 1565, 1576, 18 U.S.P.Q.2d 1001, 1010 (Fed. Cir. 1991). In particular, the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit held that a finding of anticipation requires absolute identity for each and every element set forth in the claimed invention. *See Trintec Indus. Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 63 U.S.P.Q.2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002). Additionally, the cited prior art reference must be enabling, thereby placing the allegedly disclosed matter in the possession of the public. *In re Brown*, 329 F.2d 1006, 1011, 141 U.S.P.Q. 245, 249 (C.C.P.A. 1964). Thus, the prior art reference must adequately describe the claimed invention so that a person of ordinary skill in the art could make and use the invention.

A determination under 35 U.S.C. §103 that an invention would have been obvious to someone of ordinary skill in the art is a conclusion of law based on fact. *Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co.* 810 F.2d 1593, 1 U.S.P.Q.2d 1593 (Fed. Cir. 1987), *cert. denied*, 107 S.Ct. 2187. After the involved facts are determined, the decision maker must then make the legal determination of whether the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was unknown, and just before it was made. *Id.* at 1596. The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) has the initial burden under §103 to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the prior art reference or references when combined must teach or suggest *all* the recitations of the claims, and there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. M.P.E.P. §2143. The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. M.P.E.P. §2143.01, citing *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 U.S.P.Q.2d 1430 (Fed.

In re: Tabares et al.
Serial No.: 09/992,155
Page 6

Cir. 1990). As emphasized by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, to support combining references, evidence of a suggestion, teaching, or motivation to combine must be **clear and particular**, and this requirement for clear and particular evidence is not met by broad and conclusory statements about the teachings of references. *In re Dembicza*, 50 U.S.P.Q.2d 1614, 1617 (Fed. Cir. 1999). In another decision, the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit has stated that, to support combining or modifying references, there must be **particular** evidence from the prior art as to the reason the skilled artisan, with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would have selected these components for combination in the manner claimed. *In re Kotzab*, 55 U.S.P.Q.2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

Appellants respectfully submit that the pending claims are patentable over the cited reference for at least the reason that the cited references do not disclose or suggest, at least, all of the recitations of the pending independent claims. The patentability of the pending claims is discussed in detail hereinafter.

A. Independent Claims 1, 12, 20, 31, 39, and 50 are Patentable

Independent Claims 1, 12, 20, 31, 39, and 50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Camara.

Claim 1 is directed to a method of instantiating a device driver and includes the following recitation:

dynamically associating a first software component with the device driver at run-time, **the first software component containing information that facilitates communication with devices of a specific device type.** (Emphasis added).

Claim 12 is directed to a method of collecting data from a device and recites, in part:

dynamically associating a software component with a device driver at run-time, **the software component containing information that facilitates communication with the device;**
... (Emphasis added).

Independent Claims 20, 31, 39, and 50 include similar recitations. As indicated above, the pending independent claims describe a software component being associated with a device driver

In re: Tabares et al.
Serial No.: 09/992,155
Page 7

at run-time that contains information that facilitates communication with the device. Thus, the pending independent claims recite both a device driver and a software component that is associated with the device driver at run time.

The Final Action cites paragraphs 22, 32, and 34 of Camara as disclosing the recitations of the independent claims. (Final Action, page 2). These paragraphs, however, describe a scripting driver 66 or 120 that is used to communicate with and control a hardware device, such as a scanner. Camara explains that the "[t]he scripting driver 66, the script engine 68, and the driver script 70 for a given device together serve the function of a regular device driver (e.g., the device driver 98 in FIG. 3)." (Camara, paragraph 20). It appears that the combination of the scripting driver 66, script engine 68, and driver script 70 are alleged to correspond to the device driver element recited in the independent claims. Appellants submit that Camara does not disclose or suggest the software component that is dynamically associated with the device driver at run time and facilitates communication with the device as recited in the pending independent claims.

In response to this analysis, the Final Action cites the scripting driver 120 described in paragraph 34 of Camara as corresponding to the device driver recited in the independent claims and the driver script 96 as corresponding to the software component that facilitates communication with the device and is associated with the device driver at run time. (Final Action, page 9). Appellants respectfully submit that in sharp contrast with the recitations of the pending independent claims, the driver script 96 is not dynamically associated with the scripting driver 120 at run time. Instead, as illustrated in FIG. 3 of Camara, for example, the scripting driver 120 is permanently associated with the driver script 96. As explained in paragraph 35 of Camara, the scanner scripting driver 120 receives a request to operate a scanner and uses a script engine 122 to access the appropriate driver script 96 for the particular scanner 94 that is connected to the system. Note that Camara describes the scripting driver 120 as a "scanner scripting driver 120" because the driver 120 is dedicated to scanner hardware devices and is permanently associated with the driver scripts 96 that are used to communicate with the various types of scanners 94 that can be connected to the system.

It appears that the Final Action may be interpreting the sentence "[t]he Scanner Scripting Driver 120 uses the script engine 122 to interpret and execute the textual instructions in the

In re: Tabares et al.
Serial No.: 09/992,155
Page 8

driver script 96 at run-time to operate the scanner" in paragraph 34 of Camara as suggesting that the driver script 96 is dynamically associated with the driver 120 at run-time. Appellants submit, however, that the reference to "run-time" in paragraph 34 of Camara is in relation to the script engine 122 interpreting and executing the driver script 96 at run time. That is, the driver script 96 is a script file that is written in a language that is interpreted at run-time for execution rather than a language that is compiled into machine code and executed. Camara explains that the driver script 96 is implemented as a script instead of a compilable program because "writing a script is significantly easier than developing machine-executable programs, which are also much harder to debug." (Camara, paragraph 32, last sentence). Thus, Appellants maintain that Camara fails to disclose or suggest a software component that is dynamically associated with a device driver at run time and facilitates communication with the device as recited in the pending independent claims.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Appellants submit independent Claims 1, 12, 20, 31, 39, and 50 are patentable over the cited references and that rejected dependent Claims 2 – 11, 13 – 15, 21 – 30, 32 – 34, 40 – 49, and 51 – 53 are patentable, at least, by virtue of their depending from an allowable claim. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1 – 15, 20 – 34, and 39 – 53 be reversed based on the failure of the Examiner to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation under 35 U.S.C. §102 for at least these reasons.

B. Claims 9, 14, 28, 33, 47, and 52 are Patentable

Dependent Claims 9, 14, 28, 33, 47, and 52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Camara in view of Martin et al. (Professional XML). (Final Action, page 5). Dependent Claims 9, 14, 28, 33, 47, and 52 each depend from one of the independent Claims 1, 12, 20, 31, 39, and 50 which Appellants submit are patentable for at least the reasons discussed above in Section IA. Appellants submit that dependent Claims 9, 14, 28, 33, 47, and 52 are patentable over the cited references at least by virtue of their depending on an allowable claim. *Ex parte Ligh*, 159 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 61, 62 (Bd. App. 1967). Accordingly, Appellants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 9, 14, 28, 33, 47, and 52 be reversed based on the failure of the Examiner to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103 for at least these reasons.

In re: Tabares et al.
Serial No.: 09/992,155
Page 9

C. Claims 3 – 5, 22 – 24, and 41 – 43 are Patentable

Dependent Claims 3 – 5, 22 – 24, and 41 – 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Camara in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,473,824 to Kreissig et al. (Final Action, page 5). Dependent Claims 3 – 5, 22 – 24, and 41 – 43 each depend from one of the independent Claims 1, 20, and 39, which Appellants submit are patentable for at least the reasons discussed above in Section IA. Appellants submit that dependent Claims 3 – 5, 22 – 24, and 41 – 43 are patentable over the cited references at least by virtue of their depending an allowable claim. *Ex parte Ligh*, 159 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 61, 62 (Bd. App. 1967). Accordingly, Appellants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 3 – 5, 22 – 24, and 41 – 43 be reversed based on the failure of the Examiner to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103 for at least these reasons.

D. Claims 11, 30, and 49 are Patentable

Dependent Claims 11, 30, and 49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Camara in view of U. S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0034029 to Ramberg et al. (Final Action, page 7). Dependent Claims 11, 30, and 49 each depend from one of the independent Claims 1, 20, and 39, which Appellants submit are patentable for at least the reasons discussed above in Section IA. Appellants submit that dependent Claims 11, 30, and 49 are patentable over the cited references at least by virtue of their depending an allowable claim. *Ex parte Ligh*, 159 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 61, 62 (Bd. App. 1967). Accordingly, Appellants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 11, 30, and 49 be reversed based on the failure of the Examiner to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103 for at least these reasons.

E. Claims 6, 25, and 44 are Patentable

Dependent Claims 6, 25, and 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Camara in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,473,824 to Kreissig et al. and further in view of Martin et al. (Professional XML). (Final Action, page 7). Dependent Claims 6, 25, and 44 each depend from one of the independent Claims 1, 20, and 39, which Appellants submit are

In re: Tabares et al.
Serial No.: 09/992,155
Page 10

APR 02 2007

patentable for at least the reasons discussed above in Section IA. Appellants submit that dependent Claims 6, 25, and 44 are patentable over the cited references at least by virtue of their depending an allowable claim. *Ex parte Ligh*, 159 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 61, 62 (Bd. App. 1967). Accordingly, Appellants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 6, 25, and 44 be reversed based on the failure of the Examiner to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103 for at least these reasons.

II. Conclusion

In summary, Appellants respectfully submit that the independent Claims 1, 12, 20, 31, 39, and 50 are patentable over the cited references for at least the reason that the cited reference fails to disclose or suggest all of the recitations of each of these claims. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully request reversal of the rejection of independent Claims 1, 12, 20, 31, 39, and 50 and all pending claims depending therefrom.

Respectfully submitted,


D. Scott Moore

Registration No. 42,011

Customer No. 20792
Myers Bigel Sibley & Sajovec
P. O. Box 37428
Raleigh, North Carolina 27627
Telephone: (919) 854-1400
Facsimile: (919) 854-1401

In re: Tabares et al.
Serial No.: 09/992,155
Page 11

APPENDIX A

1. (Previously presented) A computer implemented method of instantiating a device driver, comprising:

dynamically associating a first software component with the device driver at run-time, the first software component containing information that facilitates communication with devices of a specific device type.

2. (Original) A method as recited in Claim 1, further comprising:
defining a plurality of device parameters;
associating at least one of the plurality of device parameters with a service; and
communicating the at least one of the plurality of device parameters associated with the service to the device driver.

3. (Original) A method as recited in Claim 2, wherein defining the plurality of device parameters comprises:

declaring a parameter base class that defines the plurality of device parameters;
wherein associating the at least one of the plurality of device parameters with the service comprises:

deriving a service-specific sub-class from the base class that defines the at least one of the plurality of device parameters that are associated with the service;

wherein the method further comprises:
instantiating the service-specific sub-class to create a service-specific sub-class object;
and

instantiating the parameter base class to create a parameter base class object.

4. (Original) A method as recited in Claim 3, wherein communicating the at least one of the plurality of device parameters associated with the service to the device driver comprises:

In re: Tabares et al.
Serial No.: 09/992,155
Page 12

passing the at least one of the plurality of device parameters associated with the service from the service-specific sub-class object to the device driver.

5. (Original) A method as recited in Claim 1, further comprising:
defining a plurality of common device parameters;
defining a plurality of service-specific device parameters;
associating the common device parameters with the service-specific device parameters;
and

communicating the common device parameters and the service-specific device parameters to the device driver.

6. (Original) A method as recited in Claim 5, wherein defining the plurality of common device parameters comprises:

declaring a parameter base class that defines the plurality of common device parameters;
wherein defining the plurality of service-specific device parameters comprises:
providing a second software component that comprises one of a script file and an extensible markup language (XML) file; and
wherein the method further comprises:
instantiating the parameter base class to create a parameter base class object.

7. (Original) A method as recited in Claim 6, wherein associating the common device parameters with the service-specific device parameters comprises:

dynamically loading the parameter base class object with the second software component at run time.

8. (Original) A method as recited in Claim 7, wherein communicating the common device parameters and the service-specific device parameters to the device driver comprises:

passing the common device parameters and the service-specific device parameters from the parameter base class object to the device driver after loading the parameter base class object with the second software component at run time.

In re: Tabares et al.
Serial No.: 09/992,155
Page 13

9. (Original) A method as recited in Claim 1, wherein the first software component comprises one of a script file and an extensible markup language (XML) file.

10. (Original) A method as recited in Claim 1, wherein dynamically associating the first software component with the device driver at run-time comprises:

selecting the first software component from a plurality of software components, respective ones of the plurality of software components being associated with respective ones of a plurality of device types.

11. (Original) A method as recited in Claim 10, further comprising:
generating the plurality of software components based on a plurality of management information base (MIB) files, respective ones of the plurality of MIB files being associated with respective ones of the plurality of device types.

12. (Previously presented) A computer implemented method of collecting data from a device, comprising:

receiving a request to collect data from the device;
dynamically associating a software component with a device driver at run-time, the software component containing information that facilitates communication with the device; and
retrieving data from the device using the device driver.

13. (Original) A method as recited in Claim 12, wherein retrieving data from the device using the device driver comprises:

associating at least one device parameter with a service;
communicating the at least one device parameter to the device driver; and
retrieving data associated with the at least one device parameter from the device.

14. (Original) A method as recited in Claim 12, wherein the first software component comprises one of a script file and an extensible markup language (XML) file.

In re: Tabares et al.
Serial No.: 09/992,155
Page 14

15. (Original) A method as recited in Claim 12, wherein dynamically associating the software component with the device driver at run-time comprises:

selecting the first software component from a plurality of software components, respective ones of the plurality of software components being associated with respective ones of a plurality of device types.

20. (Original) A system for instantiating a device driver, comprising:
means for dynamically associating a first software component with the device driver at run-time, the first software component containing information that facilitates communication with devices of a specific device type.

21. (Original) A system as recited in Claim 20, further comprising:
means for defining a plurality of device parameters;
means for associating at least one of the plurality of device parameters with a service; and
means for communicating the at least one of the plurality of device parameters associated with the service to the device driver.

22. (Original) A system as recited in Claim 21, wherein the means for defining the plurality of device parameters comprises:

means for declaring a parameter base class that defines the plurality of device parameters;
wherein the means for associating the at least one of the plurality of device parameters with the service comprises:

means for deriving a service-specific sub-class from the base class that defines the at least one of the plurality of device parameters that are associated with the service;

wherein the system further comprises:

means for instantiating the service-specific sub-class to create a service-specific sub-class object; and

means for instantiating the parameter base class to create a parameter base class object.

In re: Tabares et al.
Serial No.: 09/992,155
Page 15

23. (Original) A system as recited in Claim 22, wherein the means for communicating the at least one of the plurality of device parameters associated with the service to the device driver comprises:

means for passing the at least one of the plurality of device parameters associated with the service from the service-specific sub-class object to the device driver.

24. (Original) A system as recited in Claim 20, further comprising:

means for defining a plurality of common device parameters;

means for defining a plurality of service-specific device parameters;

means for associating the common device parameters with the service-specific device parameters; and

means for communicating the common device parameters and the service-specific device parameters to the device driver.

25. (Original) A system as recited in Claim 24, wherein the means for defining the plurality of common device parameters comprises:

means for declaring a parameter base class that defines the plurality of common device parameters;

wherein the means for defining the plurality of service-specific device parameters comprises:

means for providing a second software component that comprises one of a script file and an extensible markup language (XML) file; and

wherein the system further comprises:

means for instantiating the parameter base class to create a parameter base class object.

26. (Original) A system as recited in Claim 25, wherein the means for associating the common device parameters with the service-specific device parameters comprises:

means for dynamically loading the parameter base class object with the second software component at run time.

In re: Tabares et al.
Serial No.: 09/992,155
Page 16

27. (Original) A system as recited in Claim 26, wherein the means for communicating the common device parameters and the service-specific device parameters to the device driver comprises:

means for passing the common device parameters and the service-specific device parameters from the parameter base class object to the device driver after loading the parameter base class object with the second software component at run time.

28. (Original) A system as recited in Claim 20, wherein the first software component comprises one of a script file and an extensible markup language (XML) file.

29. (Original) A system as recited in Claim 20, wherein the means for dynamically associating the first software component with the device driver at run-time comprises:

means for selecting the first software component from a plurality of software components, respective ones of the plurality of software components being associated with respective ones of a plurality of device types.

30. (Original) A system as recited in Claim 29, further comprising:
means for generating the plurality of software components based on a plurality of management information base (MIB) files, respective ones of the plurality of MIB files being associated with respective ones of the plurality of device types.

31. (Original) A system for collecting data from a device, comprising:
means for receiving a request to collect data from the device;
means for dynamically associating a software component with a device driver at run-time, the software component containing information that facilitates communication with the device; and
means for retrieving data from the device using the device driver.

32. (Original) A system as recited in Claim 31, wherein the means for retrieving data from the device using the device driver comprises:

In re: Tabares et al.
Serial No.: 09/992,155
Page 17

means for associating at least one device parameter with a service;
means for communicating the at least one device parameter to the device driver; and
means for retrieving data associated with the at least one device parameter from the device.

33. (Original) A system as recited in Claim 31, wherein the first software component comprises one of a script file and an extensible markup language (XML) file.

34. (Original) A system as recited in Claim 31, wherein the means for dynamically associating the software component with the device driver at run-time comprises:

means for selecting the first software component from a plurality of software components, respective ones of the plurality of software components being associated with respective ones of a plurality of device types.

39. (Original) A computer program product for instantiating a device driver, comprising:

a computer readable storage medium having computer readable program code embodied therein, the computer readable program code comprising:

computer readable program code for dynamically associating a first software component with the device driver at run-time, the first software component containing information that facilitates communication with devices of a specific device type.

40. (Original) A computer program product as recited in Claim 39, further comprising:

computer readable program code for defining a plurality of device parameters;
computer readable program code for associating at least one of the plurality of device parameters with a service; and

computer readable program code for communicating the at least one of the plurality of device parameters associated with the service to the device driver.

In re: Tabares et al.
Serial No.: 09/992,155
Page 18

41. (Original) A computer program product as recited in Claim 40, wherein the computer readable program code for defining the plurality of device parameters comprises:

computer readable program code for declaring a parameter base class that defines the plurality of device parameters;

wherein the computer readable program code for associating the at least one of the plurality of device parameters with the service comprises:

computer readable program code for deriving a service-specific sub-class from the base class that defines the at least one of the plurality of device parameters that are associated with the service;

wherein the computer program product further comprises:

computer readable program code for instantiating the service-specific sub-class to create a service-specific sub-class object; and

computer readable program code for instantiating the parameter base class to create a parameter base class object.

42. (Original) A computer program product as recited in Claim 41, wherein the computer readable program code for communicating the at least one of the plurality of device parameters associated with the service to the device driver comprises:

computer readable program code for passing the at least one of the plurality of device parameters associated with the service from the service-specific sub-class object to the device driver.

43. (Original) A computer program product as recited in Claim 39, further comprising:

computer readable program code for defining a plurality of common device parameters;

computer readable program code for defining a plurality of service-specific device parameters;

computer readable program code for associating the common device parameters with the service-specific device parameters; and

In re: Tabares et al.
Serial No.: 09/992,155
Page 19

computer readable program code for communicating the common device parameters and the service-specific device parameters to the device driver.

44. (Original) A computer program product as recited in Claim 43, wherein the computer readable program code for defining the plurality of common device parameters comprises:

computer readable program code for declaring a parameter base class that defines the plurality of common device parameters;

wherein the computer readable program code for defining the plurality of service-specific device parameters comprises:

computer readable program code for providing a second software component that comprises one of a script file and an extensible markup language (XML) file; and

wherein the computer program product further comprises:

computer readable program code for instantiating the parameter base class to create a parameter base class object.

45. (Original) A computer program product as recited in Claim 44, wherein the computer readable program code for associating the common device parameters with the service-specific device parameters comprises:

computer readable program code for dynamically loading the parameter base class object with the second software component at run time.

46. (Original) A computer program product as recited in Claim 45, wherein the computer readable program code for communicating the common device parameters and the service-specific device parameters to the device driver comprises:

computer readable program code for passing the common device parameters and the service-specific device parameters from the parameter base class object to the device driver after loading the parameter base class object with the second software component at run time.

In re: Tabares et al.
Serial No.: 09/992,155
Page 20

47. (Original) A computer program product as recited in Claim 39, wherein the first software component comprises one of a script file and an extensible markup language (XML) file.

48. (Original) A computer program product as recited in Claim 39, wherein the computer readable program code for dynamically associating the first software component with the device driver at run-time comprises:

computer readable program code for selecting the first software component from a plurality of software components, respective ones of the plurality of software components being associated with respective ones of a plurality of device types.

49. (Original) A computer program product as recited in Claim 48, further comprising:

computer readable program code for generating the plurality of software components based on a plurality of management information base (MIB) files, respective ones of the plurality of MIB files being associated with respective ones of the plurality of device types.

50. (Original) A computer program product for collecting data from a device, comprising:

a computer readable storage medium having computer readable program code embodied therein, the computer readable program code comprising:

computer readable program code for receiving a request to collect data from the device;

computer readable program code for dynamically associating a software component with a device driver at run-time, the software component containing information that facilitates communication with the device; and

computer readable program code for retrieving data from the device using the device driver.

In re: Tabares et al.
Serial No.: 09/992,155
Page 21

51. (Original) A computer program product as recited in Claim 50, wherein the computer readable program code for retrieving data from the device using the device driver comprises:

computer readable program code for associating at least one device parameter with a service;

computer readable program code for communicating the at least one device parameter to the device driver; and

computer readable program code for retrieving data associated with the at least one device parameter from the device.

52. (Original) A computer program product as recited in Claim 50, wherein the first software component comprises one of a script file and an extensible markup language (XML) file.

53. (Original) A computer program product as recited in Claim 50, wherein the computer readable program code for dynamically associating the software component with the device driver at run-time comprises:

computer readable program code for selecting the first software component from a plurality of software components, respective ones of the plurality of software components being associated with respective ones of a plurality of device types.

In re: Tabares et al.
Serial No.: 09/992,155
Page 22

APPENDIX B - EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None

In re: Tabares et al.
Serial No.: 09/992,155
Page 23

APPENDIX C – RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

None.